THE NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY

Annual Report for 1904

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family

ARTICLE I. This Association shall be called the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY.

ART. II. Its object shall be, through the improvement of public sentiment and legislation, to protect the institution of the Family, especially as affected by existing evils relating to Marriage and Divorce, and to secure its proper efficiency in individual and social life. It may co-operate with auxiliary or other bodies having similar aims in such ways as may be deemed expedient.

ART. III. It shall consist of the following persons, having power to fill vacancies and to add to their number. . . .

ART. IV. The officers of this Society shall be a President, not more than five Vice-Presidents, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, a Treasurer, and an Executive Committee of not more than twelve persons, of which committee the Corresponding Secretary shall be a member, and of which not less than three shall constitute a quorum, having the duties indicated in their several offices, to be elected at the Annual Meeting, and to hold office until their successors are appointed.

ART. V. The LEAGUE shall hold its Annual Meeting on the third Wednesday in January, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman of the Executive Committee, and at such hour and place as shall be indicated in the call of the Committee.

ART. VI. Amendments of this Constitution, of which due notice shall have been given in the call of any Annual Meeting, may be adopted at such meeting by the vote of two-thirds of the members present.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS concerning the work of the LEAGUE and its general business should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale, Mass.

CONTRIBUTIONS should be sent to the Treasurer, Mr. WOLCOTT H. JOHNSON, care of C. F. Hovey & Co., Boston.

FORM OF BEQUEST

I hereby give and bequeath to the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY, a corporation created by the Laws of the State of Connecticut, or its successors, or assigns, the sum of..... dollars, the principal [or income, as may be desired] of which is to be used for the purposes for which said Corporation was chartered.

REPORT

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family

FOR THE

Year Ending December 31, 1904

BOSTON:
THE EVERETT PRESS COMPANY, PRINTERS,
74 India Street.
1905

THE

National League for the Protection of the Family.

President.

Hon. NATHANIEL SHIPMAN, LL.D., Hartford, Conn.

Vice-Presidents.

Rt. Rev. WILLIAM LAWRENCE, D.D., LL.D., Boston.

Hon. SETH LOW, LL.D., New York.

Pres. GEORGE HARRIS, D.D., LL.D., Amherst.

Corresponding Secretary.

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

Recording Secretary.

Rev. C. H. SPALDING, D.D., Boston.

Treasurer.

WOLCOTT H. JOHNSON, Care of C. F. Hovey & Co., Boston.

Executive Committee.

Pres. W. E. HUNTINGTON, Ph.D., LL.D., Newton Centre.

Pres. GEORGE HARRIS, D.D., LL.D., Amherst.

Pres. M. H. BUCKHAM, D.D., LL.D., Burlington, Vt.

Prof. FRANCIS G. PEABODY, D.D., Cambridge.

Rev. JAMES DE NORMANDIE, D.D., Roxbury.

Prof. ALBION W. SMALL, Ph.D., LL.D., Chicago.

Rev. DANIEL MERRIMAN, D.D., Worcester.

Rev. WILLIAM H. COBB, D.D., Newton Centre.

EVERETT O. FISK, Esq., Boston.

FRANK GAYLORD COOK, Esq., Cambridge.

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

Notices.

This Report, as usual, deals only with the chief topics of the year. Preceding Reports will be found interesting for a similar reason. These can be supplied for some of the years since 1890. Other Reports can often be found in the larger public libraries. Stamps for postage will always be welcome.

The Report of the Hon. Carroll D. Wright, LL.D., Commissioner of Labor, on Marriage and Divorce in this country and Europe, is now out of print. It is hoped that this winter Congress will provide for bringing it down to date. Meanwhile, we can furnish copies of a brief "Summary of Statistics," from that Report, and a reprint of the summary of later statistics, so far as these are accessible, from our Report for 1903.

A small tract on "The Pastor and the Home;" a paper on the origin and principles of "The Home Department of the Sunday School;" a report to the National Council of Congregational Churches on "The Family;" a "Summary of the Divorce Legislation of Twenty Years;" and a leaflet on "The Work of the League" can still be supplied freely to all applicants. But our other and more important papers are out of print.

Reports of the Commissions on Uniform Legislation can be obtained from their Secretary, Albert E. Henschel, 11 Broadway, New York.

Unsolicited contributions are doubly useful in a society like the League; for they save the time of the Corresponding Secretary for his proper work. An increase of one-third would greatly add to the efficiency of the work.

Associate Annual Membership is invited from those who cannot give large sums. This is freely granted to all proper persons, both ladies and gentlemen, on payment of *five dollars* for the year. Such persons become members in full for the time. *If you cannot be a larger contributor, will you not send your request for associate membership, with the fee, and thus share in this work for the family?* Every one who has profited by the work of the League, or who believes in its mission, is urgently requested to aid us by a contribution of money.

The Treasurer, Mr. Wolcott H. Johnson, care of C. F. Hovey & Co.,

Boston, Mass., will gratefully acknowledge all contributions sent to him.

Correspondence relating to the work of the League should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, the Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., 113 Hancock Street, Auburndale, Mass. Contributions may also be sent directly to him.

Minutes.

A special meeting of the National League for the Protection of the Family, called by the Chairman of the Executive Committee, President George Harris, D.D., and by the Corresponding Secretary, S. W. Dike, LL.D., was held at the Congregational House, Room 206, at 2.30 P.M., April 18, 1904. Vice-President George Harris presided. The Secretary read the call of the meeting, the business of which was to elect a Treasurer in place of the late Mr. William G. Benedict.

The following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That in the death, March 30, 1904, of Mr. William G. Benedict, our Treasurer for twenty-three years, covering the entire existence of the League, the National League for the Protection of the Family has lost a most valuable officer and contributor. Mr. Benedict was not only an accurate and efficient Treasurer, but an officer of remarkably good judgment and fine business sense. He was also the same cautious, thoughtful, and kind gentleman, and a man whose modesty concealed much of his real ability from those who did not know him well. In quiet ways he rendered many services to us beyond his generous gifts of time and money. It is ordered that this resolution be entered in the minutes of this meeting and inserted in our next Annual Report, and that a copy be sent to the family of Mr. Benedict.

Mr. Wolcott Johnson, of Boston, was voted a member of the League. Mr. Wolcott Johnson was elected Treasurer in place of the late Mr. Benedict.

Voted to adjourn.

C. H. SPALDING,
Recording Secretary.

The annual meeting of the National League for the Protection of the Family was held in the Diocesan House, No. 1 Joy Street, Boston, on Friday, Jan. 20, 1905, at 2 P.M. In the absence of the other officers, the meeting was called to order by the Corresponding Secretary, Dr. S. W. Dike.

F. Gaylord Cook, Esq., was chosen Chairman, and William H. Cobb

Recording Secretary. Dr. Dike read in summary form the annual report of the Corresponding Secretary.

Voted, To accept the report and order it printed and distributed.

Voted, To re-elect the officers of the past year.

Voted, To accept the Treasurer's report when presented, and to refer it to E. O. Fisk as auditor.

Adjourned.

WILLIAM H. COBB,
Recording Secretary, pro tem.

Report of Corresponding Secretary.

In presenting our Twenty-fourth Annual Report we have much reason for congratulation. The year 1904 was one of unprecedented interest in problems of the Family. The Divorce question has had public attention as in no other year. The summary of the legislation on Divorce for twenty years, the action of leading churches on Divorce and the Family, the discussions of uniform laws in some of our universities, the publication of a great work on Matrimonial Institutions, the growth of the Home Department of the Sunday school, with its hundreds of thousands of members, the place the Home is getting in the attention of the Religious Education Association, and the wider public recognition of the importance of the Home are reasons for encouragement. Possibly it will be thought best to make special note of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the organization of the League next year.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES.

The receipts for the year were $2,050.78, and the expenses were $2,165.36, leaving a deficit of $114.58 for the year, instead of a small surplus to apply on the debt, as in 1903. This is a disappointment, and due in great part to exceptional conditions. One fourth of the contributions of the year were not received until December. Our friends will see the advantage to us of their sending their contributions as early in the year as practicable. It is hoped that an increasing number of individuals and churches will come to our support. The sum available for general expenses, especially for printed matter, for which there is constant inquiry beyond our ability to supply, should be largely increased.

STATISTICS.

We stated in our last Report that owing to certain conditions, due largely to the organization of the new Department of Commerce and Labor, which had more work assigned to it than the money granted to it by Congress would pay for, we thought it best to defer pressing the call for an appropriation to bring the Report of 1889 on Marriage and Divorce down to date until this winter, when it was thought conditions

would be such as to favor the appropriation. We accordingly sent in petitions and took other steps to secure the appropriation. For a time everything seemed to promise success this winter; but on the assembling of Congress it soon became evident that a policy of economy, especially in regard to undertaking any new enterprises like ours, would rule, and that it would be useless, if not worse, to press our petitions. We have accordingly dropped the subject for this session. The loss to the host of students, legislators, and others who are in the dark concerning the years since 1886, except in the case of the nine States that publish these statistics annually, is very great. It is a pity that we cannot have the few thousand dollars that will enable the Department of Commerce and Labor to supplement the invaluable Report of 1889 by one that shall bring our information down to date. But we shall in time get this.[1]

Meanwhile the States ought to provide their own statistics in many cases. There should be no good reason why such great and wealthy States as New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and others should not collect and publish annually their statistics of Births, Marriages,, Divorces, and Deaths, as well as Vermont and Rhode Island. No people of a progressive State should be without the data such publications afford. The Hon. Carroll D. Wright, in the Report of the United States government of 1889 on the subject, pointed out this need of the States and urged action to meet it. The International Statistical Society, at its meeting in this country, did the same. We urge the subject on the attention of the readers of this Report, and commend the system of Michigan as a good form to adopt. Surely these matters of the Family are of equal importance to the welfare of our people with those of material things on which we are now collecting and publishing a vast amount of information. Will not readers move in the matter?

We can still supply to applicants our abstract of the statistics contained in the Government Report of 1889, and also the summary of recent statistics of Divorce that appeared in our own Report of last year.

LEGISLATION OF THE YEAR.

As very few Legislatures held sessions in 1904, the record for the year is brief. NEW YORK provides for the enforcement in that State of judgments in cases of divorce or separation obtained in other States on the parties when they come to live in the State of New York.

NEW JERSEY forbids the marriage of those who have been judged in-

[1] A few days after writing the above I was in Washington and found conditions so favorable to immediate action that the attention of President Roosevelt was called to the subject, and he immediately promised to send in a message to the Congress, urging it to provide for the collection of statistics. This he did January 30, and we may confidently look for the desired provision this winter. It is found that the Census Office can best do the work.

sane, epileptic, and those of feeble mind except on certificate that they have become sound.

OHIO provides that no license of marriage shall issue to the classes just named, nor to habitual drunkards, nor to any one under the influence of any intoxicating liquor or narcotic drug at the time of making application for license.

LOUISIANA forbids the marriage of first cousins.

Interest in better Divorce Laws has been marked in the South the last year. Reports and inquiries regarding the best methods of proceeding to procure better laws have come lately from KENTUCKY, TENNESSEE, and TEXAS. We are especially glad to see this movement in the South; for effort at reform there is needed to meet the newer social conditions before the situation becomes more difficult. I also learn that SOUTH DAKOTA, which improved its Divorce law a few years ago by raising its term of residence, is contemplating a further improvement. A movement for better legislation is also reported from INDIANA.

THE DIVORCE LEGISLATION OF TWENTY YEARS.

From the work of Prof. George E. Howard we have compiled the following summary of the Divorce Legislation of the years 1884–1903. We think many will be surprised at the gains really made. Professor Howard says of them, "Within this period the foundation of what may sometime become a common and effective Divorce Code for the whole Union has slowly been laid."

The term of residence before an applicant can sue for Divorce has been raised from ninety days in NORTH DAKOTA, SOUTH DAKOTA, and OKLAHOMA, and from six months in ARIZONA, CALIFORNIA, and GEORGIA, to one year; except that in SOUTH DAKOTA the term is six months unless the defendant is a non-resident. NEW JERSEY requires three years if the offence is adultery. VIRGINIA prescribes one year in the county where one of the parties lives. DELAWARE forbids Divorce to all non-residents unless the alleged cause be also a statutory cause in the State of former residence. COLORADO, CONNECTICUT, and VERMONT provide fuller notice to non-resident defendants. MISSOURI and one or two other States make stricter regulations regarding domicile. MAINE alone has made conditions for parties coming into the State a little easier.

DELAWARE by constitutional amendment has transferred jurisdiction over Divorce from the Legislature to the Courts. INDIANA, NEW JERSEY, and RHODE ISLAND have provided for limited Divorces.

ARIZONA has abolished its "omnibus" clause. FLORIDA, IDAHO, UTAH, and WASHINGTON have added insanity to their legal grounds for Divorce, but generally with careful safeguards. ARKANSAS and NORTH DA-

KOTA have removed this cause from their statutes. The DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA has now only one cause for Divorce,— adultery,— in place of four, while COLORADO has added felony. PENNSYLVANIA and TEXAS restrict their provisions for Divorce for crime. A limited Divorce in LOUISIANA can now be made absolute on petition of the applicant in one year, and of the defendant after two years. MASSACHUSETTS has added the excessive use of opium and other drugs to the grounds for Divorce.

Restrictions on the remarriage of divorced persons have been made in twelve States: ALASKA, CALIFORNIA, COLORADO, IDAHO, KANSAS, MINNESOTA, MISSOURI, MONTANA, NEBRASKA, NORTH CAROLINA, NORTH DAKOTA, and WISCONSIN. This has been done in two ways: either all decrees have been made *nisi*, or operative only after six months or a year, or by positive prohibition of remarriage for one or two years.

Advertising to procure Divorces has been made illegal in CALIFORNIA, IDAHO, INDIANA, MICHIGAN, OREGON, and WASHINGTON. The State's attorney has been required to appear in cases where no other defence is made, or in all cases in COLORADO, IDAHO, INDIANA, MICHIGAN, OREGON, and WASHINGTON.

COLORADO and PENNSYLVANIA now require the insertion of the date and cause of Divorce in the marriage license of all divorced persons who remarry, and CONNECTICUT requires the statement of the fact of Divorce in the new marriage certificate.

All the six NEW ENGLAND STATES have perfected their systems for the collection and publication of their statistics of Marriage and Divorce, Maine having begun the work within the period and New Hampshire carrying it back to 1858.

Congress enacted a uniform Marriage Law for all the Territories and made the term of residence in them one year before a Divorce can be obtained. It also provided for the Report of the Department of Labor of 1889 on Marriage and Divorce in the United States and Europe, with the laws and statistics for twenty years. Thirty-five States created Commissions on Uniform Legislation on these and other subjects, which are preparing a bill on Uniform Procedure in Divorce Cases.

UNIFORM. LEGISLATION.

I have been unable to learn that the Commissions on Uniform Legislation did anything on Marriage and Divorce at their meeting in St. Louis. The president of the joint conference made some valuable suggestions on the subject, but has not responded to my request for a copy of his annual address, as he usually does with promptness.

In recent years it has been a frequent practice for law students in our universities to debate, generally with those of some other school, in a

prize contest, the subject of "Uniformity through Constitutional Amendment." In the last year this has been done in the Universities of Pennsylvania and Virginia and in the Washington and Lee University; I think also in Cornell. The students on both sides generally write me for information, and often send me accounts of their debates. I believe in every instance the choice of sides falls on that favoring constitutional amendment, and in every instance the other proves to be the winning side. The young men go into the subject with great enthusiasm and make very thorough study of it, sometimes bringing out literature of special importance. This is interesting in several ways, but especially as a confirmation of the strong tendency on the part of all who really study the subject to abandon the advocacy of an amendment of the Constitution of the United States in the interests of uniformity of law. Such an amendment we have always contended may possibly come, but it must probably wait, if it comes at all, until the experiment of coöperative State legislation has been fairly tried. A study of the legislation of the last twenty years, as sketched on another page of this Report, will show that there has been a strong, though unconscious trend in the direction towards uniformity through the independent action of the States.

LECTURES.

Lectures have been given during the year at Yale University, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J., and the General Theological Seminary in New York. More than the usual number of calls have come for addresses at meetings of ministers, before clubs and similar bodies interested in Divorce or problems of the Family. Prof. George E. Howard and myself read papers at the Congress of Arts and Science in St. Louis. These papers will be published in the Proceedings of that remarkable gathering of the scientific men of this country and Europe, and mine will be reprinted for the use of the League in four or five months. It was on "The Problem of the Family," and the first half of it was a survey of the movement of the last twenty-five years, while the remaining half attempted to outline the work that is before us in the early future.

PUBLICATIONS.

A notable work has appeared this year in "The History of Matrimonial Institutions," from the University Press of Chicago, in three large volumes. It is by Prof. George E. Howard, now of the University of Nebraska, and is the result of fifteen years of research and study.

In the preface Professor Howard says: "The Family and its cognate institutions ought to enter more fully into popular thought; and they

should have much larger relative space in the educational program. From the home circle to the university they are worthy to become a vital part of systematic social training. In the hope of aiding somewhat in winning for them due scientific recognition, this book is written. It seems not impossible that a sustained history of the matrimonial institutions of the English race in its 'three homes' may prove a positive advantage, especially in gathering the materials and planning the work for more detailed investigations." It is to be remembered that this is not a history of the immense subject of the Family, much less of the Home, but only of Marriage and Divorce, though much light is incidentally thrown on the whole subject of the Family— and it is a history of these institutions in the English-speaking race only.

But the work is incomparably better done than ever before, and much of it is original and in fields that have been hitherto inaccessible. The first half is probably the most accurate survey and best estimate of the results of recent scholarship regarding Marriage and Divorce in primitive society in existence. The account of the rise of ecclesiastical marriage is extremely interesting, and of great practical value to the student of the relation of the Church to marriage. Strange as it may seem to the ordinary reader, it was not until the thirteenth century that the Church obtained full control of the marriage ceremony. It came only after a long struggle by which it was gradually acquired from the possession of the families concerned, or of the secular authorities. And the struggle between the State and the Church for the control of marriage is one of the most interesting and at the same time one of the most intricate subjects of the historical student; yet a knowledge of the movement is of great value to the student of the modern problem of legislation and of church action on the subject.

The last half of the second volume and almost the entire third volume is nearly all an entirely original contribution to the history of Marriage and Divorce in the United States. The Colonial period is fully covered for the first time. It was our desire that the Government Report of 1889 on Marriage and Divorce should give an account of the legislation of the country from the earliest times, if practicable; but it was found to be as much as could be done to go over the twenty years covered by the statistics then collected. Yet Professor Howard, alone and without the aid of government resources, has investigated every statute of the Colonies and States from the first down to 1904. In some instances he had to go through unpublished Colonial Records.

For us this is one of the most valuable parts of his work. It enables the legislator and the student to see for himself just what has been the trend of American law and what needs to be done.

THE LEADING PROTESTANT CHURCHES ON DIVORCE.

There has been more interest in the churches on the subject of Divorce than in any former year. The Methodist Episcopal Church at its last General Conference, recognizing a united effort on the part of Protestant Churches of the United States, through an Inter-Church Conference, "to rouse the religious and moral sentiment of the land in defence of the purity and stability of the marriage relation," did two things: it provided for representation on this Conference proposed by the Protestant Episcopal Church, and it called the special attention of all its ministers to the law of the Methodist Church relating to the marrying of divorced persons, and earnestly insisted upon the necessity of strict obedience to it. This law allows no Divorce except for adultery, and forbids ministers to solemnize marriage in any case where there is a divorced wife or husband living. It makes an exception in case of the innocent party in a Divorce for adultery and in the reunion of divorced parties.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, North, adopted a somewhat elaborate report. According to it, some ten National Churches are represented on the Inter-Church Conference, which it regards as "not alone a significant, providential opportunity to immediate duty regarding the grave questions at first suggested for consideration, but also a providential opportunity to bind together the forces of righteousness, represented by the Christian Churches of our country, for the suppression of other evils and for the advancement of other reforms."

The General Assembly then enjoined all the ministers of the Church to refuse to perform the marriage ceremony in the cases of divorced persons except those divorced for causes allowed by the standards of the Church. It issued an appeal and address on the subject, and requested that it be read by pastors from their pulpits. The attention of the Presbyteries was called to this action, and they were requested to exercise needful oversight and discipline to secure the enforcement of existing laws and obedience to the injunctions of the General Assembly. It continued its Committee on Marriage and Divorce, with instructions to vigorous work. And finally it, in recognition of the principle of comity between churches, advised each of its ministers to refuse to unite persons in marriage coming from other churches whose marriage is prohibited under the rules of their own Church, unless in the peculiar circumstances of a given case the refusal would do injustice to an innocent person who has been divorced for Scriptural reasons.

The great debate for several days in the House of Deputies of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church was so widely

reported that little need be said of it. The proposed canon doing away with all Divorce was defeated, though a majority vote for it was secured in the Committee of the Whole. The old canon which allows Divorce for adultery only, and marriage to the innocent party was, however, in the judgment of most, strengthened by certain provisions. A year must elapse before the innocent party in the case of the Divorce for adultery can be remarried. Evidence of the facts in the case, including a copy of the court decree, and record if practicable, with proof that the defendant was personally served with notice and appeared in the action, must be laid before the ecclesiastical authority, who, having taken legal advice thereon, shall issue a license to such remarriage. It is further provided that it shall be within the discretion of any minister to decline to celebrate the marriage of all divorced persons. In this way the canon does not bind the conscience of the large class of Episcopal ministers who have conscientious objections to the remarriage of all divorced persons.

The National Council of Congregational Churches took a step farther in response to a memorial of your Secretary. For in addition to charging its committee with the duty of coöperating with the committees of other churches, it made it the special duty of this "standing committee on the relation of the Church to the present problems of Family life; said committee to be charged with the studious inquiry into the material, industrial, educational, and legal conditions upon which the fulfilment of the functions of the Family depends, and the recommendation of such attitude and action of the churches thereto as their own interests and those of the Family alike require in view of the facts." This committee is to begin its work at once, and report at the end of three years to the next Council.

Perhaps other national bodies of Christians have taken similar action during the year. I have noted action by the Southern Unitarians, the Massachusetts Baptists, the Maryland Lutherans, and the Illinois Methodists. All these, except the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, agree with the present position of the Protestant Episcopal Church. The Congregationalists, Baptists, and others with an independent church polity, of course can only advise their local churches, not having power to make rules for the whole. The Congregationalists and the others are probably in substantial agreement with the general position. The Presbyterians allow Divorce for desertion under certain conditions. A conference of the Inter-Church Committees will be held in Washington within a few days.[1]

[1] This conference was held January 25 and 26, and important action was taken unanimously. The results of its proceedings will be published very soon.

THE BROADER OUTLOOK FOR THE CHURCH.

The action of the Council of the Congregationalists is noteworthy for its outlook beyond the matter of restraints upon the marriage of improper persons, however important that may be. It rests on the assumption that neither the legislation of the State nor the discipline of the Church is sufficient to meet the evil; for the problem is a social one, and therefore must be treated by the use of the entire range of social forces. As a people we are slowly coming to see that this is true of all our social problems, and that it is, therefore, only as we work all along the line that we can hope for the highest success, even in any one direction. The religious, educational, industrial, and political interests of society are so interwoven that wise efforts at reform in any one direction must act upon all these interests to secure real progress in any one of them. For these reasons I should like it had the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church appointed a standing committee similar to the one of the Congregationalists. Such a committee in a Church strong in its scholarship and its recognition of organic relations could have done a great work for us all. The lack of that specific study of the possibilities of the Home as a factor in the work of the Church which we have given to the Sunday School and other agencies for training people in collections like societies or assemblies, the resources which modern study of the institutions of society have given us, and the evident need of finding the true place of the Home in the work of life, and seeing that it fills that place, should make this an inviting field of work for the eager student and the earnest pastor.

THE HOME DEPARTMENT OF THE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

The success of this institution, which we outlined and put into the hands of the Sunday-School societies to show what could be done in this very direction, is an evidence of the solid ground on which this line of suggestion rests. Probably the Home Department has never grown faster than in the last two or three years. The statistics of the Massachusetts Sunday School Association show that there are now 34,000 members of the Home Department in this State alone. This is ten per cent of the total Sunday-School membership of the State. A like ratio throughout the country would give a million and a third; but at present the number is nothing like this figure. Nearly all of these are so many additions to the Sunday School. Only the other day one of the best of the State home missionary secretaries spoke of the marvellous aid this institution was giving to pastors.

Owing to peculiar misunderstandings, which are now in the way of correction so that all doubt will be removed as to the origin and precise

principles underlying the Home Department, the institution had a slow growth for some years, from its being embarrassed with machinery that did not belong to it and that obscured its simplicity. But the practical good sense of leaders in the field led to a return to the original simplicity of the plan, and now the historical ground is being cleared to the same purpose. Let our pastors see that the Home Department be used so as to set the Home about its own work. Further, let some try to apply its principle in other directions. Why should not the Home of those who do attend the sessions of the Sunday School be assigned a certain class of work in the study of the Bible, or in other religious instruction, be held responsible for doing it, and then leave the Sunday School to supplement the work of the Home and not supplant that work? To our mind one of the greatest needs of the educational field is that of a more intelligent division of the common work between the Church School, the Public School, and the Home, so that each can work in an intelligent coöperation with the others. At present each of these three institutions is doing its own work too much by itself. Waste, duplication, and work at cross-purposes are inevitable until the principles of social coöperation are applied.

SOME NOTABLE UTTERANCES REGARDING THE HOME.

I think more of these have come to my notice this year than in any former year of our League. Take this one from President Woodrow Wilson, of Princeton University, in the *Sunday School Times:*

"We must realize that the first and most intimate organization for the indoctrinating of the next generation is the Home, is the Family. This is the key to the whole situation. That is the reason that you must get hold of the whole Family when you get hold of the children in your Sunday-School work; that your work will not be more than half done when you merely get the children there, and, it may be, their mothers. You must include the fathers and get your grip on the Home organization in such wise that the children will have the atmospheric pressure of Christianity the week through."

This is from an article on "The Young People and the Church." Would that both the Sunday-School leaders and those who manage the affairs of our Young People's Societies would make this principle, which is eminently one of sound sociology, the real force it should be in all work for the young.

Then take this, from the resolutions of the last meeting of the Religious Education Association. It is the third of the four resolutions adopted at the convention:

"That the most important institution for the development of charac-

ter is the Family. Yet precisely here disintegrating forces are most evident. Partly through neglect, partly through the difficulty of adjusting Family training to the complications of modern life, the rising generation is being largely neglected at the most vital point."

Attention is called here to the half-dozen papers and addresses on the Home in the early part of the volume of the Proceedings of this convention. One will have to go far to find more that is suggestive on this subject than what may be found in these thirty-five pages. The Religious Education Association in its broad treatment of its field cannot fail to reach far into this important subject. What we said on a previous page on the great need of a better coördination of social forces for their common ends receives emphasis from these quotations. And we make no apology for repeating in our Reports from time to time this urgent plea for attention to the undeveloped resources of the Home. Important as we hold Church and State action on Marriage and Divorce, we believe it is of far more importance that the Church and all other social institutions bring the latent powers of the Home into their proper activity in their true place in society. When our churches will spend a tenth of the money and personal effort that they have put into the Sunday School and Young People's Societies on work directly for the Home, new life will be given to the religious and other social agencies of our land. Will not those who see the truth of our contention put themselves at work along this line, and see that others are stirred up to join in the work?

Mr. William G. Benedict, who was our Treasurer from the first, died suddenly early in the year. Some notice of our sense of loss in his death will be found in the Minutes of the meeting held April 18, to elect a successor. We consider ourselves fortunate in securing the services of Mr. Wolcott H. Johnson, of C. F. Hovey and Company, Boston, as Treasurer.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL W. DIKE,

Corresponding Secretary.

Jan. 20, 1905.

Treasurer's Report.

RECEIPTS		$2,050 78
EXPENSES		
Express and Telephone	$5 05	
Postage	46 25	
Stationery	7 10	
Printing	114 05	
Travelling	124 11	
Advertising	18 80	
Rent	50 00	
		365 36
		$1,685 42
Applied to salary of Rev. S. W. Dike, Secretary		1,685 42
Amount of debt January 1, 1904		258 50
Deficit for year 1904		114 58
Amount of debt January 1, 1905		$373 08

JANUARY 20, 1905.

I have this day examined the Treasury accounts and find the same to be correct.

EVERETT O. FISK, *Auditor.*

CONTRIBUTIONS.

Jan. 1.	Mrs. Samuel Colt, Hartford, Conn.	$ 40 00	
1.	Hon. Seth Low, LL.D., New York	50 00	
9.	Rev. Francis Goodwin, Hartford, Conn.	20 00	
13.	Hon. Nathaniel Shipman, LL.D., Hartford, Conn.	25 00	
18.	President W. E. Huntington, LL.D., Newton Center	5 00	
20.	Frank Gaylord Cook, Cambridge	2 00	
26.	Miss Edith Woolsey, New Haven, Conn.	5 00	
26.	Col. Jacob L. Greene, Hartford, Conn.	35 00	
	Received in January		$182 00
Feb. 1.	Mrs. W. E. Dodge, New York	$100 00	
1.	Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Boston	25 00	
4.	Rt. Rev. W. H. Hare, D.D., Sioux Falls, S. D.	5 00	

Feb.	4.	James C. Braman, Auburndale	$10 00
	5.	Hon. Lyman D. Brewster, Danbury, Conn.	5 00
	5.	Rev. G. L. Demarest, D.D., Manchester, N. H.	5 00
	5.	Rev. Charles F. Dole, Jamaica Plain	5 00
	5.	Rev. W. Spooner Smith, Worcester	10 00
	6.	President Edward M. Gallaudet, LL.D., Washington, D. C.	10 00
	6.	Robert C. Ogden, New York	25 00
	8.	Mrs. Charlotte F. Blackman, Waterbury, Conn.	10 00
	8.	Rev. S. C. Bushnell, Arlington	3 00
	9.	Hon. Arthur T. Lyman, Boston	5 00
	9.	Rev. W. P. Alcott, Boxford	2 00
	12.	Hon. Robert D. Benedict, Brooklyn, N. Y.	10 00
	12.	Rev. D. Stuart Dodge, New York, N. Y.	20 00
	12.	Old South Church, Boston	25 00
	12.	Hon. Moses Giddings, Bangor, Me.	5 00
	12.	Rev. Thomas W. Thompson, Worcester	5 00
	12.	Rt. Rev. Daniel S. Tuttle, D.D., LL.D., St. Louis, Mo.	5 00
	17.	Rev. W. H. Cobb, D.D., Newton Center	5 00
	17.	Prof. E. Y. Hincks, D.D., Andover	5 00
	17.	St. Ann's Woman's Missionary Society, Brooklyn, N. Y.	5 00
	17.	Asylum Hill Congregational Church, Hartford, Conn.	25 00
	24.	Alfred T. White, Brooklyn, N. Y.	10 00
	27.	Rev. Charles G. Ames, Boston	5 00
	28.	Rt. Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D., Burlington, Vt.	5 00
	28.	Rev. George B. Johnson, Burlington, Vt.	5 00
	29.	Rev. A. Moss Merwin, Pasadena, Cal.	3 00
		Received in February	$358 00
Mar.	2.	First Congregational Church, Waterbury, Conn.	$ 18 63
	3.	John D. R. Lamson, Toledo, O.	10 00
	3.	First Baptist Church, Newton Center	15 00
	4.	Charles E. Ranlett, Auburndale	5 00
	7.	Alfred Metcalf, Providence, R. I.	5 00
	7.	Grace Church, New York, N. Y.	50 00
	7.	Rt. Rev. Alexander H. Vinton, D.D., Springfield	10 00
	8.	Rt. Rev. William C. Doane, D.D., LL.D., Albany, N. Y.	5 00
	10.	Grace Church, Providence, R. I.	25 00
	18.	Rev. F. N. Peloubet, D.D., Auburndale	10 00
	24.	Rev. Joshua Coit, Winchester	1 00
	31.	Rev. Cornelius H. Patton, D.D., Boston	5 00
		Received in March	$159 63
Apr.	2.	George Burnham, Sr., Philadelphia, Pa.	$ 25 00
	7.	Miss Martha C. Burgess, Dedham	5 00
	7.	Rev. J. W. McIlvain, D.D., Baltimore, Md.	1 00
	9.	Mrs. George H. Corliss, Providence, R. I.	10 00
	11.	Prof. Henry W. Farnham, R. P. D., New Haven, Conn.	25 00
	15.	Rev. Walker Gwynne, Summit, N. J.	1 00

Apr. 15.	President William J. Tucker, D.D., LL.D., Hanover, N. H.	$10 00	
20.	John Davis, Lincoln, Neb.	1 00	
26.	Park Congregational Church, Norwich, Conn.	10 00	
	Received in April		$ 88 00
May 3.	Rt. Rev. W. N. McVickar, D.D., Providence, R. I.	$ 20 00	
3.	Hon. James Tillinghast, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
3.	Rathbone Gardner, Providence, R. I.	5 00	
7.	Rt. Rev. Alexander Mackay-Smith, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.	15 00	
13.	Rt. Rev. Chauncey B. Brewster, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	3 00	
	Received in May		$ 53 00
June 12.	Miss Alice Byington, Stockbridge	$ 5 00	
12.	Ginn and Company, Boston	10 00	
12.	Mrs. Richard H. Dana, Cambridge	5 00	
12.	George Ripley, Andover	10 00	
14.	Hon. Samuel B. Capen, LL.D., Boston	10 00	
14.	Congregational Church, Watertown, Conn.	17 50	
14.	Rev. Arthur Lawrence, D.D., Stockbridge	25 00	
16.	William P. Henzey, Philadelphia, Pa.	25 00	
17.	Samuel V. Hoffman, New York	25 00	
17.	Herbert A. Wilder, Newton	10 00	
18.	Hon. James Schouler, LL.D., Boston	5 00	
30.	Miss Virginia Butler, Stockbridge	10 00	
	Received in June		$157 50
July 8.	Mrs. C. P. Turner, Philadelphia, Pa.	$ 25 00	
19.	St. John's Parish, Stamford, Conn.	19 65	
23.	William B. Taylor, Lynn	5 00	
26.	Rev. J. B. Clark, D.D., New York	5 00	
27.	Rt. Rev. Leighton Coleman, D.D., LL.D., Wilmington, Del.	3 00	
30.	"A Friend," Haddam, Conn.	5 00	
	Received in July		$ 62 65
Aug. 8.	Hon. William B. Plunkett, Adams	$ 10 00	
8.	Dr. William C. Rives, Lenox	10 00	
16.	Rev. A. B. Hunter, Raleigh, N. C.	5 00	
31.	William J. Breed, Cincinnati, Ohio	5 00	
	Received in August		$ 30 00
Sept. 14.	Trinity Church, Newport, R. I.	$ 10 00	
15.	Prof. C. R. Henderson, D.D., Chicago, Ill.	2 00	
16.	Hon. R. H. Gardiner, Boston	5 00	
	Received in September		$ 17 00
Oct. 6.	Mrs. John S. Mitchell, Waterbury, Conn.	$ 50 00	
6.	Hon. Frederick J. Kingsbury, LL.D., Waterbury, Conn.	25 00	
7.	"A Vermont Lady"	50 00	
8.	Mrs. Wallace H. Camp, Waterbury, Conn	50 00	
15.	St. Stephen's Church, Pittsfield	10 00	

Oct.	15.	Rev. John H. Dennison, D.D., Williamstown	$10 00	
	28.	E. P. Dutton, New York	10 00	
	28.	Rev. John G. Davenport, D.D., Waterbury, Conn.	10 00	
	29.	Mrs. Gilman C. Hill, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00	
	29.	Hon. J. P. Bates, Brookline	10 00	
	29.	Mrs. George Westinghouse, Lenox	100 00	
		Received in October		$330 00
Nov.	2.	Mrs. Augustus S. Chase, Waterbury, Conn.	$ 25 00	
	2.	J. Howard Nichols, Newton	5 00	
	8.	William H. Eaton, Lee	5 00	
	9.	Hon. Edward L. Pickard, Auburndale	20 00	
	10.	Morris K. Jesup, New York	10 00	
	16.	Rev. Alfred Poole Grint, Ph.D., New London, Conn.	2 00	
	17.	William B. Herrick, Auburndale	10 00	
	19.	Rev. Herbert W. Lathe, Denver, Col.	5 00	
	20.	Dr. Lucien Howe, Buffalo, N. Y.	5 00	
	23.	St. John's Church, Waterbury, Conn.	1 00	
	23.	Mrs. John S. Brigham, Worcester	5 00	
	30.	Rev. A. W. Hazen, D.D., Middletown, Conn.	5 00	
		Received in November		$107 00
Dec.	3.	Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, LL.D., New Haven, Conn.	$ 50 00	
	3.	Prof. William North Rice, D.D., Middletown, Conn.	5 00	
	3.	Mrs. W. P. Ellison, Newton	10 00	
	3.	Hon. Francis Lynde Stetson, LL.D., New York	30 00	
	5.	Wolcott H. Johnson, Boston	25 00	
	5.	St. Agnes' Chapel, New York	10 00	
	6.	First Church, Hartford, Conn.	10 00	
	6.	Rev. Ozora S. Davis, Ph.D., New Britain, Conn.	2 00	
	6.	George Burnham, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.	25 00	
	7.	W. W. Lockwood, New York	5 00	
	7.	Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D.D., Cambridge	5 00	
	8.	Rufus B. Fowler, Worcester	5 00	
	8.	A. C. Tenney, Chelsea	1 00	
	8.	Rev. Anson Phelps Stokes, New Haven, Conn.	5 00	
	8.	Rev. George L. Paine, Dorchester	5 00	
	13.	Trinity Church, Boston	25 00	
	14.	Rev. Frederick B. Allen, Boston	5 00	
	15.	St. Stephen's Church, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
	15.	The Church Settlement Association, Concord, N. H.	5 00	
	15.	Rev. Morgan Dix, D.D., New York	10 00	
	15.	Rev. George M. Adams, D.D., Auburndale	5 00	
	16.	Rev. E. E. Strong, D.D., Auburndale	3 00	
	16.	South Evangelical Church, West Roxbury	5 00	
	16.	Pres. George Harris, D.D., LL.D., Amherst	15 00	
	19.	Hon. Robert Treat Paine, Boston	5 00	
	19.	Arthur Reed Kimball, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00	

Dec.	20.	Everett O. Fisk, Boston	$5 00
	20.	Center Congregational Church, Meriden, Conn.	5 00
	22.	Miss Lucy W. Burr, Auburndale	40 00
	23.	Rev. James W. Bixler, D.D., New London, Conn.	10 00
	27.	"A Friend," Grace Church, South Framingham	5 00
	28.	First Congregational Church, Nashua, N. H.	10 00
	28.	Church of the Ascension, New York	25 00
	29.	Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Worcester	25 00
	31.	Rev. John Phelps Taylor, D.D., Andover	5 00
	31.	Rev. Amory H. Bradford, D.D., Montclair, N. J.	5 00
	31.	Rt. Rev. W. A. Leonard, D.D., Cleveland, O.	10 00
	31.	St. John's Church, Providence, R. I.	20 00
	31.	Pres. Henry Hopkins, D.D., LL.D., Williamstown	5 00
	31.	Miss Edith Woolsey, New Haven, Conn.	5 00
	31.	Anonymous	25 00
	31.	Mrs. Coolidge S. Roberts, Cambridge	20 00
		Received in December	$506 00

The National League for the Protection of the Family.

The League stands for catholic, scientific, and practical methods in the protection and the improvement of the Family, and its development in a wholesome social order. Marriage, Divorce, Polygamy, Chastity, etc., are regarded as parts of one inclusive problem of the Family. And the Family and its growth into the Home, it is held, should be the constant concern of Religion, Education, Industry, and Patriotism. The relative neglect of the Family in the past, and the place it now holds in all departments of social science and in practical philosophy, compel an increasing attention to it. Mr. James Bryce has said, "One might almost say that the Family is the fundamental and permanent problem of human society." And Prof. F. G. Peabody says, "More and more we have come to see within the last few years that the problem of the Family is the *crux* of modern civilization."

Practical results already appear. The League proposed and secured the Government Report on Marriage and Divorce, which President Roosevelt asks Congress to bring down to date. It did much to secure the Thirty-five State Commissions on Uniform Legislation. It has been the leading agency in securing better systems of Marriage license and record in several States. In Divorce the removal of "omnibus" and insanity clauses for divorce and other useful legislation have come about. Within the last twenty years seven States have made the advertising of divorce business illegal. Six have provided for the defence of all, or of uncontested cases. Twelve have placed restrictions on the remarriage of divorced persons. Three have provided for limited divorces. DELAWARE has forbidden the granting of divorces to all non-residents for causes not on the statute-book of their own State. The DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA has reduced its causes from four to one, and many minor regulations have been made. And thirty-five States have created Commissions on Uniform Legislation.

The educational work behind legislation is still more important. Lectures and sometimes courses of lectures have been given in over sixty universities, theological seminaries, and other higher educational insti-

tutions, and we are in constant touch with such institutions by correspondence and the putting of our reports and papers in libraries, where they are eagerly sought by legislators, professors, and students. Twenty years ago the Family and its incident problems were rarely touched in these institutions. Now they are common themes of study.

Reviews and the periodical press have been used very largely by the Secretary and others in the treatment of our subjects. A literature of the Family is growing up. The great work of Prof. G. E. Howard, on the "History of Matrimonial Institutions," just published, is an instance. Our Annual Reports are sought by many for their survey of progress and their discussions of vital questions.

Correspondence is a means of keeping in touch with legislators, specialists, and others who seek our aid. It has been our aim to do all that is possible through others.

The interest of all the leading churches, the Home Department of the Sunday School, now officially recognized as our own invention, an increasing interest in the Home as a factor in the work of the pastor, the philanthropist, the educator, and the man of business, may also be cited in evidence of the usefulness of the League.

A small constituency of exceptional intelligence has hitherto been the chief support of this fundamental and constructive work. We now ask all to contribute, *and to make some sacrifice, if need be, to aid it.* We cannot meet many of the calls that come to us, for lack of means. Unsolicited donations are especially helpful.

Checks may be sent to the Treasurer, Wolcott H. Johnson, care of C. F. Hovey and Co., Boston, or directly to the Corresponding Secretary, Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., 113 Hancock Street, Auburndale, Mass.